REMARKS

Claims 1-22 have been rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 15 have been amended.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended, which recites "displaying validation information about the metadata to indicate whether the data block is valid or invalid," is limited to a practical application in the technological arts. Support for this practical application can be found in the application as filed.

For example, the specification states that "Data corruption is a significant problem for file system users. Technical support people spend large amounts of time and money on data recovery operations, to attempt to identify and repair corrupt data." (Paragraph 5). "[The prior art] does not indicate which portion of the data block is corrupt." (Paragraph 7). "Thus, there is a need for a tool that allows a user to view, analyze and repair corruption in data blocks of data files in a file system." (Paragraph 8).

Support for displaying validation information about the metadata to indicate that the data block is valid can be found in paragraphs 28 and 29, which state that "The various metadata elements contained in the header 210, body 220, or tail 230 of the data block are displayed here. Some of the metadata elements are also validated by the graphical user interface 100, or by the validation module 120 (of FIG. 1). For example, the checksum element 370 displays a checksum value, as stored in the header 210 of the data block. The checksum value is a value that is used to help determine if the data block is corrupted...."

Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended is limited to a practical application because the method, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible, and useful result, i.e., the method indicates

whether a data block has valid data. This valid indication is useful to technical support people who want to identify corrupt data.

Given that claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 as amended, applicants submit that these claims also recite statutory subject matter.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The examiner states that "Claims 9-14 are not claimed to be practiced on a computer, therefore, it is clear that the claims are not limited to practice in the technological arts. On that basis alone, they are clearly nonstatutory."

Claim 9 as amended recites "A computer processing system." Claim 9 as amended also recites "a graphical user interface ... for displaying validation information ... indicating whether the data block contains valid data." Therefore, applicant submits that claim 9 as amended has a practical application within the technological arts. Given that claims 10-14 depend from claim 9 as amended, applicants submit that these claims also recite statutory subject matter.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 15 as amended recites "displaying validation information about the metadata to indicate whether the data block is valid or invalid," which is a practical application in the technological arts. Given that claims 16-22 depend from claim 15 as amended, applicants submit that these claims also recite statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to disclose how to practice a practical application within the technological arts. Applicant submits that claims 1-22 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Support for the practical application of displaying validation information about the metadata to indicate whether the data block is valid, as recited in claim 1 as amended, can be found in paragraphs 28 and 29, which state that "The various metadata elements contained in the header 210, body 220, or tail 230 of the data block are displayed here. Some of the metadata elements are also validated by the graphical user interface 100, or by the validation module 120 (of FIG. 1). For example, the checksum element 370 displays a checksum value, as stored in the header 210 of the data block. The checksum value is a value that is used to help determine if the data block is corrupted...."

Therefore, applicant submits that claim 1 as amended satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Given that claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 as amended, applicant submits that these claims also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant further submits that claims 9-22 also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is

believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any

questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the

number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: April 14, 2004

By: _____
Jeffrey S. Smith
Reg. No. 39,377

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4422
Telefax: (650) 849-4800